



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,001	12/26/2001	Jerry Mizell	14441RRUS01U	1838
7590	11/28/2006		EXAMINER	
James A. Harrison P.O. Box 670007 Dallas, TX 75367			PHUNKULH, BOB A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/034,001	MIZELL ET AL.	
	Examiner Bob A. Phunkulh	Art Unit 2616	
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
<b>Period for Reply</b>			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>			
<b>Status</b>			
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12 September 2006</u>.</p> <p>2a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is <b>FINAL</b>.                    2b)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p>			
<b>Disposition of Claims</b>			
<p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-18</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-18</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p>			
<b>Application Papers</b>			
<p>9)<input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)<input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.      Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).      Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</p> <p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</p>			
<b>Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119</b>			
<p>12)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> All    b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <p>1.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</p> <p>2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</p> <p>3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p>			
<p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p>			
<b>Attachment(s)</b>			
<p>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)      Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____</p>		<p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)      Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>	

## DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to applicant's 09/12/2006 amendment(s)/response(s) in the application of **MIZELL et al.** for "**METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR NETWORK-INITIATED CONTEXT ACTIVATION USING DYNAMIC DNS UPDATES**" filed 12/26/2001. The amendments/response to the claims have been entered. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Claims 1, 3-18 are now pending.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-8, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dorenbosch et al.* (US 2002/0138622), hereinafter *Dorenbosch*, in view of *Viola et al.* (US 2003/0058813), hereinafter *Viola*.

Regarding claim 1, *Dorenbosch* discloses a method in a network for wireless communications for pushing data through a data packet network utilizing a dynamic addressing scheme, comprising:

transmitting, from a push server to a DNS, a look up signal for a specified domain name (the push server initiates the session by sending a query message to the DNS,

where the query message corresponds to the user name of the mobile device, see paragraph 0033);

receiving the reserved dynamic IP address at the push server (the DNS server will access its database, retrieve the mobile devices long lived address, insert the address into the DNS message body of a response DNS message; and send the response DNS message to the originator of the query, see paragraph 0033);

and activating a context, based upon the reserved dynamic IP address through the data packet network (sent the one or more packets to the mobile device using the assigned address, see paragraph 0033).

*Dorenbosch* fails to explicitly disclose that transmitting a reservation signal from the DNS to a DHCP server to prompt the DHCP to reserve a dynamic IP address for a mobile terminal that corresponds to the specified domain name.

*Viola*, on the other hand, discloses a wireless network comprising: a GGSN 20 coupled to both DNS server 30 and DHCP server, see figure 1. Also, it is well known in the art that the DHCP is used for dynamically assigning IP address to nodes. In addition, DHCP allows support manual, automatic, and dynamically address assignment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made cause the system operator of to program the DNS to receives the IP addresses from *Viola*'s DHCP in order to provides the network with ability to dynamically assign the IP addresses to the requesting users i.e. mobile users.

Regarding claim 16, *Dorenbosch* discloses a domain name server (DSN server 111), comprising:

circuitry for receiving a domain name lookup request from a push server to determine an IP address that corresponds to a received domain name (the server 111 receives a query signal from a push server, see paragraph 0033); and

circuitry for transmitting a request to a DHCP server to prompt it to temporarily reserve a dynamic IP address for delivery of push data to a mobile terminal (the server, also function as DHCP, includes a database for allocating IP address for the mobile devices, see paragraphs 0018 and 0020).

*Dorenbosch* fails explicitly discloses transmitting a reservation signal from the DNS to a DHCP server to prompt the DHCP to reserve a dynamic IP address for a mobile terminal that corresponds to the specified domain name.

*Viola*, on the other hand, discloses a wireless network comprising: a GGSN 20 coupled to both DNS server 30 and DHCP server, see figure 1. Also, it is well known in the art that the DHCP is used for dynamically assigning IP address to nodes. In addition, DHCP allows support manual, automatic, and dynamically address assignment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made cause the system operator of to program the DNS to receives the IP addresses from *Viola*'s DHCP in order to provides the network with ability to dynamically assign the IP addresses to the requesting users i.e. mobile users.

Regarding claims 3, 7, 17-18, *Dorenbosch* fails explicitly discloses transmitting a reservation signal from the DNS to a DHCP server to prompt the DHCP to reserve a dynamic IP address for a mobile terminal that corresponds to the specified domain name.

*Viola*, on the other hand, disclose a wireless network comprising: a GGSN 20 coupled to both DNS server 30 and DHCP server, see figure 1. Also, it is well known in the art that the DHCP is used for dynamically assigning IP address to nodes. DHCP allows support manual, automatic, and dynamically address assignment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made cause the system operator of to program the DNS to receives the IP addresses from *Viola*'s DHCP in order to provides the network with ability to dynamically assign the IP addresses to the requesting users i.e. mobile users.

Regarding claim 4, *Dorenbosch* discloses transmitting the reserved dynamic IP address from the DNS to the push server after receiving a signal requesting that a dynamic IP address be reserved (the DNS server transmitting the IP address to the push server, see paragraph 0033).

Regarding claim 5, *Dorenbosch* discloses the received signal requesting that a dynamic IP address be reserved is in the form of a DNS lookup request signal (in the form of a query, see paragraph 0033).

Regarding claim 6, *Dorenbosch* discloses activating a context includes the step, in a GGSN, of receiving push data for a mobile terminal and also receiving the reserved dynamic IP address from the push server (the GGSN 121 receives data from both mobile terminal 117 via link 127 and push server 103, see figure 1).

Regarding claim 8, *Dorenbosch* discloses the transmitting the request to an HLR (119) to identify a serving GPRS support node (GGSN 121) that is presently serving the mobile terminal (see figure 1).

Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Viola* in view of *Dorenbosch*.

Regarding claims 9 and 12-13, *Viola* discloses a method in a Gateway GPRS Support Node for pushing data through a data packet network utilizing a dynamic addressing scheme, comprising:

receiving a reserved dynamic IP address and push data from a server (receiving IP address query from the applicant server 40 at the GGSN 20, see col. 1 lines 51 to col. 2 line 14);

transmitting a request for ID information to a DHCP server relating to the reserved dynamic IP address (the GGSN 20 transmit a request in response to the address query from the applicant server 40, see col. 1 lines 51 to col. 2 line 14);

receiving the requested ID information (see col. 1 lines 51 to col. 2 line 14); and

activating a context through the data packet network so that the push data may be transmitted to its destination having the reserved dynamic IP address (col. 3 lines 22-29).

*Viola*, on the other hand, fails to explicitly disclose that the server 40 is push server.

*Dorenbosch*, on the other hand, discloses receiving a push server 103 connected to a server for initiating a push session between a push client and the mobile by forwarding from the push client to the server the user name (see abstract, and paragraph 0020).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made replace *Viola*'s application server 40 with *Dorenbosch*'s push server 103 for allowing and providing the efficient delivery of services initiated through a public network and directed to a mobile device through a private network, such as the services that may be expected from a push client.

Regarding claims 10–11, 14-15, *Viola* fails to explicitly disclose transmitting a request to an HLR to identify a serving GPRS support node that is presently serving the mobile terminal for which the reserved dynamic IP address was reserved and to which the requested ID information corresponds.

*Dorenbosch*, on the other hand, discloses the transmitting the request to an HLR (119) to identify a serving GPRS support node (GGSN 121) that is presently serving the mobile terminal (see figure 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made includes the HLR of Dorenbosch in the system taught by *Viola* in order to the service provider with capability to verify/identify the requesting user.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 9/12/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to the applicant's arguments, Dorenbosch discloses transmitting from the push client 103 (push server) a look up signal to the server 111, may be DNS server, see paragraph 0018. If the server 111 is a DNS server, the system operator program the database with addresses and user names in various manners.

*Viola* disclose a wireless network comprising: a GGSN 20 coupled to both DNS server 30 and DHCP server, see figure 1. Also, it is well known in the art that the

Art Unit: 2616

DHCP is used for dynamically assigning IP address to nodes. DHCP allows support manual, automatic, and dynamically address assignment. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made cause the system operator to program the DNS server to receives the IP addresses assignment from the DHCP server.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine the references can be found in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art i.e. telecomm dictionaries (see the definition of DHCP<sup>1</sup>).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

---

<sup>1</sup> See Newton's Telecom Dictionary by Harry Newton 14<sup>th</sup> updated and expended edition.

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

The following address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) only:

Mail Stop \_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**or faxed to:**

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

The following address mail to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, Hand Delivery, etc.) as follow:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
220 20<sup>th</sup> Street South  
Customer Window, Mail Stop \_\_\_\_\_  
Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03  
Arlington, VA 22202.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Bob A. Phunkulh** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3083**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tursday from 8:00 A.M.

to 5:00 P.M. (first week of the bi-week) and Monday-Friday (for second week of the bi-week).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor **Wellington Chin**, can be reached on **(571) 272-3134**. The fax phone number for this group is **(571) 273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Bob A. Phunkulh  
Primary Examiner  
TC 2600                   **BOB PHUNKULH**  
*Technology Division 2616*      **PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
November 27, 2006